

GS.I The general supervision instruments and procedures (including monitoring, complaint and hearing resolution, etc.), used by the SEA, identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner.

1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

District data for the 2nd cycle of monitoring (1996-97 through 2000-01)

Year	# initial reviews	# requiring follow-up 1	# requiring follow-up 2	# requiring follow-up 3	# requiring follow-up 4	% non-compliant at initial review
1996-97	107	85	20	6	0	79.4%
1997-98	103	80	20	5	0	77.7%
1998-99	94	87	35	9	0	92.6%
1999-00	117	103	29	1	0	88.0%
2000-01	108	89	4	0	0	82.4%

District data for 3rd cycle of monitoring (2001-02 through 2005-06)

Year	# initial reviews	# requiring follow-up 1	# requiring follow-up 2	# requiring follow-up 3	# requiring follow-up 4	% non-compliant at initial review
2001-02	102	87 (76 completed 11 not completed)	27 (15 completed 12 not completed)	6		85.3%
2002-03	100	95 (3 completed 92 not completed)	1			95.0%
2003-04	110 (70 reviews completed as of 3/30/04)	46				

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04

Formulas: Percent of districts non-compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts reviewed

Initial monitoring reviews find at least one area of noncompliance in 80-90% of districts, indicating that noncompliance is being identified. Many of the districts are found in compliance at the first follow-up; however, approximately 20-30% require second follow-ups. Performance indicators found out of compliance require an assurance statement from the district and are not included in the follow-up reviews except as desk audits of data.

As of March 30, 2004, there are 12 second follow-ups that have not yet been completed on district reviews initially held in 2001-02. These incomplete reviews are currently in process. Two are scheduled as on-site reviews and the remainder will be desk reviews of information submitted by the districts. All final reports will be issued by September 1, 2004.

2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

- Focus monitoring and technical assistance on areas identified as problem areas in previous monitoring and child complaints.

3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

Missouri is currently in the third year of a five-year monitoring cycle during which all school districts in the state are reviewed. Special Education monitoring is completed in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) district review and accreditation process. For a full description of the Special Education Monitoring system, see <http://www.dese.state.mo.us/divspeced/Compliance/MSIP/index.html>. In brief, districts attend training and complete a self-assessment the year prior to the MSIP review. The self-assessments are submitted to the Division and monitoring staff use the self-assessment results combined with a desk review to determine which districts will receive an on-site monitoring. Some monitoring standards and indicators have been changed slightly during this cycle in response to findings from previous years, but the majority of the review has been consistent for this cycle. Performance standards are increasingly becoming more of a focus.

Alan Coulter from the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (funded by OSEP) will be working with Missouri to establish more of a focused monitoring system for the next five-year cycle.

4. Projected Targets:

- Continue to focus on areas identified as problem areas in previous monitoring and child complaints
- The percent of districts found out of compliance on initial reviews decreases
- The percent of districts found out of compliance on child complaints decreases
- Additional targets are included in the Future Activities Table

5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:

See also GS.V

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.1 GS.I	A) Convene a meeting of stakeholders (District special education directors, law enforcement, Department of Social Services, Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Corrections, Missouri Juvenile Justice Association) to discuss development and implementation of procedures to make a timely identification of students with disabilities held in city and county jails and provide required special education or related services.	1.1.1.1 Meeting convened 1.1.1.2 Plan developed 1.1.1.3 Plan implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY04 plan implemented • FY04 monitoring results indicate that youth with disabilities incarcerated in city and county jails are being located and provided with services in a timely manner. 	Timelines: December 2003 Plan Implemented Resources: <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports. <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.2 GS.I	B) Written Technical Assistance distributed to stakeholders to inform them of the state and federal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	<p>1.1.2.1 Listserv message to districts</p> <p>1.1.2.2 Content of technical assistance developed</p> <p>1.1.2.3 Dissemination method identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY04 technical information distributed FY04 monitoring results indicate that youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails are located and provided services in a timely manner. 	<p>Timelines: August 2003 - July 2004</p> <p>Information distributed</p> <p>Resources: <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>
1.1.3 GS.I	C) FY04 Monitoring procedures revised to incorporate interview of district staff and student file review specific to locating and providing services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	<p>1.1.3.1 Monitoring procedures revised and implemented</p> <p>1.1.3.2 Interview questions developed</p> <p>1.1.3.3 File review procedures updated</p> <p>1.1.3.4 Revised procedures implemented with 2003-2004 MSIP districts (includes Kansas City and St. Louis)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised procedures implemented 	<p>Timeline s: September 2003</p> <p>Resources: <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>
1.1.5 GS.I GS.II	E) District special education monitoring self-assessment (SEMSA) revised to include reporting of district procedures to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	<p>1.1.5.1 Data obtained on district procedures to locate and provide services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District special education monitoring self-assessment (SEMSA) includes procedures for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities 	<p>Timelines: September 2003 Revisions developed (for SEMSA due April 1, 2004)</p> <p>Resources: <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports</p> <p><u>Funding Type:</u> Part B</p>